

The Sun

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1903.

Subscription by Mail—Post-paid.
DAILY, Per Month, \$3.00
DAILY, Per Year, \$30.00
SUNDAY, Per Year, \$10.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$35.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, \$3.00
WEEKLY, Per Year, \$10.00
Foreign, Per Year, \$12.00
Single Copies, 10 Cents
THE SUN, New York City.

Advertisements for THE WEEKLY SUN, dated to-morrow morning, must be handed in this evening before 4 o'clock.

The Two Topics.

So distant an observer as the London Times reports of the New York campaign that two prominent subjects are discussed—the Chicago Fair and Tammany Hall.

To perfect its report the Times should have credited each one of these topics to its rightful source. It is the Democrats who are talking of the Fair, and the Republicans who are talking Tammany Hall.

They cannot mention the World's Fair without throwing up the sponge. To discuss it in the simplicity of the patriotic Republicans who did their best to head off the unswerving determination of the PLATT partisans to get it out of New York, is to invite openly the hundred thousand majority to come and overwhelm them as they prophesied it would come.

The other topic heard by the London Times, that of Tammany Hall, represents a queer trick. Seeing hopelessness in assaulting the angry array of the Empire State Democracy, the Republicans stand off and shout "Tammany Hall." In the hope of irritating some factional Democrats to an attack on the ticket.

It is the scheme of desperation. And it won't work.

A Senator Who Does Not Read the Laws.

This is a good year for the Democracy to redeem the Eighth Senate district, represented in the last Legislature by the Hon. LISPENARD STEWART. Mr. STEWART was elected in 1899 by only 305 plurality, and there were two Democratic candidates in the field with a combined vote of 12,146, against a Republican vote of 11,094.

MARTIN T. MCMAHON is making a strong fight against Mr. LISPENARD STEWART, and deserves to beat him. Gen. MCMAHON has positive ideas respecting the press-gag law of 1888. He is not afraid to express his opinions.

Mr. LISPENARD STEWART, on the other hand, has never found time even to read the Electrical Execution law. He has no opinion on the subject of the right of the New York newspapers to publish the news. He has nothing to say concerning the attempt of the cranks commanded by Commodore GERRY to gag a free press.

We do not see how any self-respecting newspaper can support the ill-informed and indolent Mr. STEWART. Nor do we see why any intelligent Republican citizen should vote for the indifferent and ill-informed Mr. STEWART, as against a gentleman who is so incomparably his superior in appreciating the importance of guarding jealously one of the most precious of American liberties.

Gladstone's Home Rule Scheme Ready.

It has for some time been generally acknowledged by the Gladstonians that no matter how large a majority they might obtain at the next general election, they would not reintroduce the Home Rule bill of 1893 in its original form. As to what changes would be made, however, there has been no authoritative announcement. The Gladstonians, taking for granted that none would be made until the contest at the ballot box was over, have professed to believe that Mr. GLADSTONE does not know his own mind, or is afraid to let the Liberal electors know what they will be voting for.

As a matter of fact, Mr. GLADSTONE has formed a definite conception of what he will do for Ireland, and means to proclaim it before the election. It is not usually deemed judicious to expose all the details of a proposed measure to the eyes of enemies and lukewarm friends during the campaign preceding a general election. Provisions which would be swallowed with more or less reluctance after an overwhelming triumph of the Liberal party at the ballot box might cause Gladstonians to falter and waver while the outcome of the contest was uncertain. The political tactician at present unite in accepting the guidance of Mr. GLADSTONE are extremely heterogeneous, and a Home Rule bill which would be acceptable to one section might be distasteful to another. It is also probable that a large number of Mr. GLADSTONE's English followers care much less about Irish grievances and their remedies than they do about reforms which directly affect their own interests. Under such circumstances, if their leader's intentions with regard to home rule were left undefined, it would be possible for campaign speakers in each English constituency to dwell with especial emphasis on the features of the Liberal programme especially attractive to that locality. On the other hand, the opponents of the Home Rule bill, which Mr. GLADSTONE is resolved to pass, and it will necessarily become the pivot of discussion. The other aims and promises of which so much was said at the meeting of the Liberal Federation in Newcastle will gradually be lost sight of, and the contest will ultimately turn on the single question whether Ireland should have a particular kind of State government.

A Conservative Jury.

In these days when it is so fashionable for fresh air to be blown by funds to denounce the system of trial by jury, it is often told that juries cannot be relied upon to do justice in cases where corporations are defendants, and that they invariably find against the corporation, right or wrong. A curious case has just been tried in New Jersey which illustrates not only the inaccuracy of this idea, but also a singular difference between the laws of New Jersey and the laws of New York in respect to the condemnation of lands for railroad uses.

Mr. EDEN LAING of Rahway was the owner of a piece of land in Union county which the Pennsylvania Railroad desired to take, in the exercise of the power of eminent domain conferred upon that corporation by statute. A commission was appointed to appraise the value of the property thus condemned. The commission decided that it was worth \$7,500. Under the law of New Jersey the property owner in such a case has a right to appeal to the courts and there the case would be tried by a jury. Mr. LAING took this course and carried the controversy into the Union County Court, where the case was tried before a jury. This jury on Friday decided

in favor of Mr. GLADSTONE's return to power. Relying on this specious argument, they would undoubtedly encourage the House of Lords to reject the measure and thus compel a second appeal to the country. On the other hand, the Lords would scarcely dare to throw out a bill, all of whose details had been subjected to vigilant inspection and thorough discussion during a political campaign. By resisting the unanimous, explicit fiat of the nation they would imperil the existence of the hereditary chamber. Not the concession of home rule to Ireland, but the abolition of the upper House would be the question on which the ensuing election would turn. Mr. GLADSTONE has, in other words, determined that the judgment rendered by the British nation in the approaching trial of the Irish cause shall be conclusive and beyond appeal.

The details of the new measure have not yet been made known to us, though it is expected that they will be very shortly. We are especially curious to learn what arrangements will be made for regulating Ireland's contribution to the imperial revenues, and whether the control of the Irish consular will be delegated to the new Dublin Government. On the answers given to these questions largely depends the maintenance of harmonious relations between the Gladstonians and the McCarthyites. It is already announced that the revised scheme embodies one of Mr. PARSELL's demands, namely, that appointments to the Irish judiciary shall be made by the Irish executive. We are also informed, as indeed we have long had reason to expect, that Ireland will continue to be represented at Westminster, though whether by as many members as she now sends is not stated. One more feature of the amended plan has been divulged, viz., that the Dublin legislature will consist of two chambers, though on what principle the upper House is to be constituted is not mentioned. It is very doubtful whether the Nationalists would tolerate a restoration of legislative rights to the Irish peerage.

An Innocent Abroad.

The Hon. ANDREW DICKSON WHITE, magnanimously forgiving the little bunco game of which he was the victim at Rochester, left his library for a few hours last Saturday and spoke a piece at the Cooper Union in favor of Hungary. Mr. WHITE has studied what he called the "art of religion" and has a good deal to say about it. He is a member of the State of New York not at all. One or two things in his Cooper Union speech betray a simplicity of ignorance that deserves to be set right. Mr. WHITE is more at home in the middle ages than in 1891, and he doesn't know what is going on outside of his library. "Why," he asks, "was Mr. FLOWER nominated?" If Mr. WHITE will ask some of the Ithaca Democrats this question, they will tell him that Mr. FLOWER was nominated because the Democratic party of the State of New York wanted to nominate him. If Mr. WHITE seeks to know why it wanted to nominate Mr. FLOWER, the Hon. FRANCIS KERNAN, a U.S. Senator who may be known in Ithaca, will tell him. Here are Mr. KERNAN's reasons:

Because Mr. FLOWER is well qualified.

Because Mr. FLOWER is anxious to do his duty well for his own sake and the sake of New York.

Because Mr. FLOWER's scrupulous integrity in the past gives assurance that he will be the uncompromising foe of jobbery of any kind.

Because Mr. FLOWER is a shrewd judge of men; it is certain that his appointments to office will be of the best character.

Because Mr. FLOWER will not be subservient to any man or set of men.

Here is another passage of Mr. WHITE's speech penned in the library:

"I come now to another question which is both national and State, and I trust that our independent friends will not fail to commend me to their remarks upon it. It is the question of the reform of the civil service of this country. Now, that simply means that the vast number of civil offices in this country are filled by men who are appointed, and without regard to the public interest; but that they shall be distributed in the same manner as is the case where the office is filled by election, and without regard to the public interest, and I am sure that our friends will not fail to commend me to their remarks upon it."

Then Mr. WHITE proceeded to pour molasses upon the Administration for its fidelity to this principle. The Hon. JOEL B. EHRHARDT sat on the platform. If Mr. WHITE were familiar with contemporary politics, he would know that Mr. EHRHARDT resigned the post of Collector of this port because the power of appointing and controlling the officials was given to the boss of Mr. WHITE's party in New York.

"The Collector," said Mr. EHRHARDT, "has been reduced to a position where he is no longer an independent official, but is a mere tool of the Administration."

"The recent policy of the Treasury Department has been to control the details of the customs administration of this country," said Mr. EHRHARDT, "and to dictate to a private individual having no official responsibility. The Collector is practically deprived of power and control while he is left subject to all the whims and caprices of the Administration, and I am sure that our friends will not fail to commend me to their remarks upon it."

Mr. FASSETT meekly accepted the place which Mr. EHRHARDT was too proud to hold. Mr. FASSETT accepted the nomination for Governor under the same humiliating conditions. If it is civil service reform for the Administration to make Mr. PLATT dictator at the Custom House, Gen. HARRISON is a civil service reformer. If seeking to make Mr. PLATT boss of the State patronage is fighting against the distribution of political spoils to a boss, Mr. WHITE is helping civil service reform this year. But the fact is that Mr. WHITE, hearing Mr. PLATT yell "Tammany," has got up in the innocence of his heart and begun to yell "Fire." His nightcap has fallen down upon his venerable eyes, and he is not to be blamed for seeing what is not and not seeing what is.

It is likely enough that Mr. GLADSTONE will lose some votes by a frank and full avowal of his purposes with respect to Ireland, and, if he were a younger man, he might prefer to postpone their publication until he had resumed the responsibilities of office. But at his advanced age he cannot reasonably expect to take part in more than a general election, and to him, therefore, it is of vital moment that the verdict of the people on that occasion shall be unequivocal and peremptory. With his precarious tenure of life he cannot leave it to the power of the Unionists to say that, while the electors might have acquiesced in the bestowal of some kind of home rule on Ireland, they by no means sanctioned the delinquent scheme which was for the first time

put forward after Mr. GLADSTONE's return to power. Relying on this specious argument, they would undoubtedly encourage the House of Lords to reject the measure and thus compel a second appeal to the country. On the other hand, the Lords would scarcely dare to throw out a bill, all of whose details had been subjected to vigilant inspection and thorough discussion during a political campaign. By resisting the unanimous, explicit fiat of the nation they would imperil the existence of the hereditary chamber. Not the concession of home rule to Ireland, but the abolition of the upper House would be the question on which the ensuing election would turn. Mr. GLADSTONE has, in other words, determined that the judgment rendered by the British nation in the approaching trial of the Irish cause shall be conclusive and beyond appeal.

The details of the new measure have not yet been made known to us, though it is expected that they will be very shortly. We are especially curious to learn what arrangements will be made for regulating Ireland's contribution to the imperial revenues, and whether the control of the Irish consular will be delegated to the new Dublin Government. On the answers given to these questions largely depends the maintenance of harmonious relations between the Gladstonians and the McCarthyites. It is already announced that the revised scheme embodies one of Mr. PARSELL's demands, namely, that appointments to the Irish judiciary shall be made by the Irish executive. We are also informed, as indeed we have long had reason to expect, that Ireland will continue to be represented at Westminster, though whether by as many members as she now sends is not stated. One more feature of the amended plan has been divulged, viz., that the Dublin legislature will consist of two chambers, though on what principle the upper House is to be constituted is not mentioned. It is very doubtful whether the Nationalists would tolerate a restoration of legislative rights to the Irish peerage.

Mr. LISPENARD STEWART, on the other hand, has never found time even to read the Electrical Execution law. He has no opinion on the subject of the right of the New York newspapers to publish the news. He has nothing to say concerning the attempt of the cranks commanded by Commodore GERRY to gag a free press.

We do not see how any self-respecting newspaper can support the ill-informed and indolent Mr. STEWART. Nor do we see why any intelligent Republican citizen should vote for the indifferent and ill-informed Mr. STEWART, as against a gentleman who is so incomparably his superior in appreciating the importance of guarding jealously one of the most precious of American liberties.

It has for some time been generally acknowledged by the Gladstonians that no matter how large a majority they might obtain at the next general election, they would not reintroduce the Home Rule bill of 1893 in its original form. As to what changes would be made, however, there has been no authoritative announcement. The Gladstonians, taking for granted that none would be made until the contest at the ballot box was over, have professed to believe that Mr. GLADSTONE does not know his own mind, or is afraid to let the Liberal electors know what they will be voting for.

As a matter of fact, Mr. GLADSTONE has formed a definite conception of what he will do for Ireland, and means to proclaim it before the election. It is not usually deemed judicious to expose all the details of a proposed measure to the eyes of enemies and lukewarm friends during the campaign preceding a general election. Provisions which would be swallowed with more or less reluctance after an overwhelming triumph of the Liberal party at the ballot box might cause Gladstonians to falter and waver while the outcome of the contest was uncertain. The political tactician at present unite in accepting the guidance of Mr. GLADSTONE are extremely heterogeneous, and a Home Rule bill which would be acceptable to one section might be distasteful to another. It is also probable that a large number of Mr. GLADSTONE's English followers care much less about Irish grievances and their remedies than they do about reforms which directly affect their own interests. Under such circumstances, if their leader's intentions with regard to home rule were left undefined, it would be possible for campaign speakers in each English constituency to dwell with especial emphasis on the features of the Liberal programme especially attractive to that locality. On the other hand, the opponents of the Home Rule bill, which Mr. GLADSTONE is resolved to pass, and it will necessarily become the pivot of discussion. The other aims and promises of which so much was said at the meeting of the Liberal Federation in Newcastle will gradually be lost sight of, and the contest will ultimately turn on the single question whether Ireland should have a particular kind of State government.

It is likely enough that Mr. GLADSTONE will lose some votes by a frank and full avowal of his purposes with respect to Ireland, and, if he were a younger man, he might prefer to postpone their publication until he had resumed the responsibilities of office. But at his advanced age he cannot reasonably expect to take part in more than a general election, and to him, therefore, it is of vital moment that the verdict of the people on that occasion shall be unequivocal and peremptory. With his precarious tenure of life he cannot leave it to the power of the Unionists to say that, while the electors might have acquiesced in the bestowal of some kind of home rule on Ireland, they by no means sanctioned the delinquent scheme which was for the first time

put forward after Mr. GLADSTONE's return to power. Relying on this specious argument, they would undoubtedly encourage the House of Lords to reject the measure and thus compel a second appeal to the country. On the other hand, the Lords would scarcely dare to throw out a bill, all of whose details had been subjected to vigilant inspection and thorough discussion during a political campaign. By resisting the unanimous, explicit fiat of the nation they would imperil the existence of the hereditary chamber. Not the concession of home rule to Ireland, but the abolition of the upper House would be the question on which the ensuing election would turn. Mr. GLADSTONE has, in other words, determined that the judgment rendered by the British nation in the approaching trial of the Irish cause shall be conclusive and beyond appeal.

The details of the new measure have not yet been made known to us, though it is expected that they will be very shortly. We are especially curious to learn what arrangements will be made for regulating Ireland's contribution to the imperial revenues, and whether the control of the Irish consular will be delegated to the new Dublin Government. On the answers given to these questions largely depends the maintenance of harmonious relations between the Gladstonians and the McCarthyites. It is already announced that the revised scheme embodies one of Mr. PARSELL's demands, namely, that appointments to the Irish judiciary shall be made by the Irish executive. We are also informed, as indeed we have long had reason to expect, that Ireland will continue to be represented at Westminster, though whether by as many members as she now sends is not stated. One more feature of the amended plan has been divulged, viz., that the Dublin legislature will consist of two chambers, though on what principle the upper House is to be constituted is not mentioned. It is very doubtful whether the Nationalists would tolerate a restoration of legislative rights to the Irish peerage.

Mr. LISPENARD STEWART, on the other hand, has never found time even to read the Electrical Execution law. He has no opinion on the subject of the right of the New York newspapers to publish the news. He has nothing to say concerning the attempt of the cranks commanded by Commodore GERRY to gag a free press.

We do not see how any self-respecting newspaper can support the ill-informed and indolent Mr. STEWART. Nor do we see why any intelligent Republican citizen should vote for the indifferent and ill-informed Mr. STEWART, as against a gentleman who is so incomparably his superior in appreciating the importance of guarding jealously one of the most precious of American liberties.

It has for some time been generally acknowledged by the Gladstonians that no matter how large a majority they might obtain at the next general election, they would not reintroduce the Home Rule bill of 1893 in its original form. As to what changes would be made, however, there has been no authoritative announcement. The Gladstonians, taking for granted that none would be made until the contest at the ballot box was over, have professed to believe that Mr. GLADSTONE does not know his own mind, or is afraid to let the Liberal electors know what they will be voting for.

As a matter of fact, Mr. GLADSTONE has formed a definite conception of what he will do for Ireland, and means to proclaim it before the election. It is not usually deemed judicious to expose all the details of a proposed measure to the eyes of enemies and lukewarm friends during the campaign preceding a general election. Provisions which would be swallowed with more or less reluctance after an overwhelming triumph of the Liberal party at the ballot box might cause Gladstonians to falter and waver while the outcome of the contest was uncertain. The political tactician at present unite in accepting the guidance of Mr. GLADSTONE are extremely heterogeneous, and a Home Rule bill which would be acceptable to one section might be distasteful to another. It is also probable that a large number of Mr. GLADSTONE's English followers care much less about Irish grievances and their remedies than they do about reforms which directly affect their own interests. Under such circumstances, if their leader's intentions with regard to home rule were left undefined, it would be possible for campaign speakers in each English constituency to dwell with especial emphasis on the features of the Liberal programme especially attractive to that locality. On the other hand, the opponents of the Home Rule bill, which Mr. GLADSTONE is resolved to pass, and it will necessarily become the pivot of discussion. The other aims and promises of which so much was said at the meeting of the Liberal Federation in Newcastle will gradually be lost sight of, and the contest will ultimately turn on the single question whether Ireland should have a particular kind of State government.

It is likely enough that Mr. GLADSTONE will lose some votes by a frank and full avowal of his purposes with respect to Ireland, and, if he were a younger man, he might prefer to postpone their publication until he had resumed the responsibilities of office. But at his advanced age he cannot reasonably expect to take part in more than a general election, and to him, therefore, it is of vital moment that the verdict of the people on that occasion shall be unequivocal and peremptory. With his precarious tenure of life he cannot leave it to the power of the Unionists to say that, while the electors might have acquiesced in the bestowal of some kind of home rule on Ireland, they by no means sanctioned the delinquent scheme which was for the first time

put forward after Mr. GLADSTONE's return to power. Relying on this specious argument, they would undoubtedly encourage the House of Lords to reject the measure and thus compel a second appeal to the country. On the other hand, the Lords would scarcely dare to throw out a bill, all of whose details had been subjected to vigilant inspection and thorough discussion during a political campaign. By resisting the unanimous, explicit fiat of the nation they would imperil the existence of the hereditary chamber. Not the concession of home rule to Ireland, but the abolition of the upper House would be the question on which the ensuing election would turn. Mr. GLADSTONE has, in other words, determined that the judgment rendered by the British nation in the approaching trial of the Irish cause shall be conclusive and beyond appeal.

The details of the new measure have not yet been made known to us, though it is expected that they will be very shortly. We are especially curious to learn what arrangements will be made for regulating Ireland's contribution to the imperial revenues, and whether the control of the Irish consular will be delegated to the new Dublin Government. On the answers given to these questions largely depends the maintenance of harmonious relations between the Gladstonians and the McCarthyites. It is already announced that the revised scheme embodies one of Mr. PARSELL's demands, namely, that appointments to the Irish judiciary shall be made by the Irish executive. We are also informed, as indeed we have long had reason to expect, that Ireland will continue to be represented at Westminster, though whether by as many members as she now sends is not stated. One more feature of the amended plan has been divulged, viz., that the Dublin legislature will consist of two chambers, though on what principle the upper House is to be constituted is not mentioned. It is very doubtful whether the Nationalists would tolerate a restoration of legislative rights to the Irish peerage.

Mr. LISPENARD STEWART, on the other hand, has never found time even to read the Electrical Execution law. He has no opinion on the subject of the right of the New York newspapers to publish the news. He has nothing to say concerning the attempt of the cranks commanded by Commodore GERRY to gag a free press.

We do not see how any self-respecting newspaper can support the ill-informed and indolent Mr. STEWART. Nor do we see why any intelligent Republican citizen should vote for the indifferent and ill-informed Mr. STEWART, as against a gentleman who is so incomparably his superior in appreciating the importance of guarding jealously one of the most precious of American liberties.

It has for some time been generally acknowledged by the Gladstonians that no matter how large a majority they might obtain at the next general election, they would not reintroduce the Home Rule bill of 1893 in its original form. As to what changes would be made, however, there has been no authoritative announcement. The Gladstonians, taking for granted that none would be made until the contest at the ballot box was over, have professed to believe that Mr. GLADSTONE does not know his own mind, or is afraid to let the Liberal electors know what they will be voting for.

As a matter of fact, Mr. GLADSTONE has formed a definite conception of what he will do for Ireland, and means to proclaim it before the election. It is not usually deemed judicious to expose all the details of a proposed measure to the eyes of enemies and lukewarm friends during the campaign preceding a general election. Provisions which would be swallowed with more or less reluctance after an overwhelming triumph of the Liberal party at the ballot box might cause Gladstonians to falter and waver while the outcome of the contest was uncertain. The political tactician at present unite in accepting the guidance of Mr. GLADSTONE are extremely heterogeneous, and a Home Rule bill which would be acceptable to one section might be distasteful to another. It is also probable that a large number of Mr. GLADSTONE's English followers care much less about Irish grievances and their remedies than they do about reforms which directly affect their own interests. Under such circumstances, if their leader's intentions with regard to home rule were left undefined, it would be possible for campaign speakers in each English constituency to dwell with especial emphasis on the features of the Liberal programme especially attractive to that locality. On the other hand, the opponents of the Home Rule bill, which Mr. GLADSTONE is resolved to pass, and it will necessarily become the pivot of discussion. The other aims and promises of which so much was said at the meeting of the Liberal Federation in Newcastle will gradually be lost sight of, and the contest will ultimately turn on the single question whether Ireland should have a particular kind of State government.

It is likely enough that Mr. GLADSTONE will lose some votes by a frank and full avowal of his purposes with respect to Ireland, and, if he were a younger man, he might prefer to postpone their publication until he had resumed the responsibilities of office. But at his advanced age he cannot reasonably expect to take part in more than a general election, and to him, therefore, it is of vital moment that the verdict of the people on that occasion shall be unequivocal and peremptory. With his precarious tenure of life he cannot leave it to the power of the Unionists to say that, while the electors might have acquiesced in the bestowal of some kind of home rule on Ireland, they by no means sanctioned the delinquent scheme which was for the first time

put forward after Mr. GLADSTONE's return to power. Relying on this specious argument, they would undoubtedly encourage the House of Lords to reject the measure and thus compel a second appeal to the country. On the other hand, the Lords would scarcely dare to throw out a bill, all of whose details had been subjected to vigilant inspection and thorough discussion during a political campaign. By resisting the unanimous, explicit fiat of the nation they would imperil the existence of the hereditary chamber. Not the concession of home rule to Ireland, but the abolition of the upper House would be the question on which the ensuing election would turn. Mr. GLADSTONE has, in other words, determined that the judgment rendered by the British nation in the approaching trial of the Irish cause shall be conclusive and beyond appeal.

The details of the new measure have not yet been made known to us, though it is expected that they will be very shortly. We are especially curious to learn what arrangements will be made for regulating Ireland's contribution to the imperial revenues, and whether the control of the Irish consular will be delegated to the new Dublin Government. On the answers given to these questions largely depends the maintenance of harmonious relations between the Gladstonians and the McCarthyites. It is already announced that the revised scheme embodies one of Mr. PARSELL's demands, namely, that appointments to the Irish judiciary shall be made by the Irish executive. We are also informed, as indeed we have long had reason to expect, that Ireland will continue to be represented at Westminster, though whether by as many members as she now sends is not stated. One more feature of the amended plan has been divulged, viz., that the Dublin legislature will consist of two chambers, though on what principle the upper House is to be constituted is not mentioned. It is very doubtful whether the Nationalists would tolerate a restoration of legislative rights to the Irish peerage.

Mr. LISPENARD STEWART, on the other hand, has never found time even to read the Electrical Execution law. He has no opinion on the subject of the right of the New York newspapers to publish the news. He has nothing to say concerning the attempt of the cranks commanded by Commodore GERRY to gag a free press.

We do not see how any self-respecting newspaper can support the ill-informed and indolent Mr. STEWART. Nor do we see why any intelligent Republican citizen should vote for the indifferent and ill-informed Mr. STEWART, as against a gentleman who is so incomparably his superior in appreciating the importance of guarding jealously one of the most precious of American liberties.

It has for some time been generally acknowledged by the Gladstonians that no matter how large a majority they might obtain at the next general election, they would not reintroduce the Home Rule bill of 1893 in its original form. As to what changes would be made, however, there has been no authoritative announcement. The Gladstonians, taking for granted that none would be made until the contest at the ballot box was over, have professed to believe that Mr. GLADSTONE does not know his own mind, or is afraid to let the Liberal electors know what they will be voting for.

As a matter of fact, Mr. GLADSTONE has formed a definite conception of what he will do for Ireland, and means to proclaim it before the election. It is not usually deemed judicious to expose all the details of a proposed measure to the eyes of enemies and lukewarm friends during the campaign preceding a general election. Provisions which would be swallowed with more or less reluctance after an overwhelming triumph of the Liberal party at the ballot box might cause Gladstonians to falter and waver while the outcome of the contest was uncertain. The political tactician at present unite in accepting the guidance of Mr. GLADSTONE are extremely heterogeneous, and a Home Rule bill which would be acceptable to one section might be distasteful to another. It is also probable that a large number of Mr. GLADSTONE's English followers care much less about Irish grievances and their remedies than they do about reforms which directly affect their own interests. Under such circumstances, if their leader's intentions with regard to home rule were left undefined, it would be possible for campaign speakers in each English constituency to dwell with especial emphasis on the features of the Liberal programme especially attractive to that locality. On the other hand, the opponents of the Home Rule bill, which Mr. GLADSTONE is resolved to pass, and it will necessarily become the pivot of discussion. The other aims and promises of which so much was said at the meeting of the Liberal Federation in Newcastle will gradually be lost sight of, and the contest will ultimately turn on the single question whether Ireland should have a particular kind of State government.

It is likely enough that Mr. GLADSTONE will lose some votes by a frank and full avowal of his purposes with respect to Ireland, and, if he were a younger man, he might prefer to postpone their publication until he had resumed the responsibilities of office. But at his advanced age he cannot reasonably expect to take part in more than a general election, and to him, therefore, it is of vital moment that the verdict of the people on that occasion shall be unequivocal and peremptory. With his precarious tenure of life he cannot leave it to the power of the Unionists to say that, while the electors might have acquiesced in the bestowal of some kind of home rule on Ireland, they by no means sanctioned the delinquent scheme which was for the first time

put forward after Mr. GLADSTONE's return to power. Relying on this specious argument, they would undoubtedly encourage the House of Lords to reject the measure and thus compel a second appeal to the country. On the other hand, the Lords would scarcely dare to throw out a bill, all of whose details had been subjected to vigilant inspection and thorough discussion during a political campaign. By resisting the unanimous, explicit fiat of the nation they would imperil the existence of the hereditary chamber. Not the concession of home rule to Ireland, but the abolition of the upper House would be the question on which the ensuing election would turn. Mr. GLADSTONE has, in other words, determined that the judgment rendered by the British nation in the approaching trial of the Irish cause shall be conclusive and beyond appeal.

The details of the new measure have not yet been made known to us, though it is expected that they will be very shortly. We are especially curious to learn what arrangements will be made for regulating Ireland's contribution to the imperial revenues, and whether the control of the Irish consular will be delegated to the new Dublin Government. On the answers given to these questions largely depends the maintenance of harmonious relations between the Gladstonians and the McCarthyites. It is already announced that the revised scheme embodies one of Mr. PARSELL's demands, namely, that appointments to the Irish judiciary shall be made by the Irish executive. We are also informed, as indeed we have long had reason to expect, that Ireland will continue to be represented at Westminster, though whether by as many members as she now sends is not stated. One more feature of the amended plan has been divulged, viz., that the Dublin legislature will consist of two chambers, though on what principle the upper House is to be constituted is not mentioned. It is very doubtful whether the Nationalists would tolerate a restoration of legislative rights to the Irish peerage.

Mr. LISPENARD STEWART, on the other hand, has never found time even to read the Electrical Execution law. He has no opinion on the subject of the right of the New York newspapers to publish the news. He has nothing to say concerning the attempt of the cranks commanded by Commodore GERRY to gag a free press.

We do not see how any self-respecting newspaper can support the ill-informed and indolent Mr. STEWART. Nor do we see why any intelligent Republican citizen should vote for the indifferent and ill-informed Mr. STEWART, as against a gentleman who is so incomparably his superior in appreciating the importance of guarding jealously one of the most precious of American liberties.

It has for some time been generally acknowledged by the Gladstonians that no matter how large a majority they might obtain at the next general election, they would not reintroduce the Home Rule bill of 1893 in its original form. As to what changes would be made, however, there has been no authoritative announcement. The Gladstonians, taking for granted that none would be made until the contest at the ballot box was over, have professed to believe that Mr. GLADSTONE does not know his own mind, or is afraid to let the Liberal electors know what they will be voting for.

As a matter of fact, Mr. GLADSTONE has formed a definite conception of what he will do for Ireland, and means to proclaim it before the election. It is not usually deemed judicious to expose all the details of a proposed measure to the eyes of enemies and lukewarm friends during the campaign preceding a general election. Provisions which would be swallowed with more or less reluctance after an overwhelming triumph of the Liberal party at the ballot box might cause Gladstonians to falter and waver while the outcome of the contest was uncertain. The political tactician at present unite in accepting the guidance of Mr. GLADSTONE are extremely heterogeneous, and a Home Rule bill which would be acceptable to one section might be distasteful to another. It is also probable that a large number of Mr. GLADSTONE's English followers care much less about Irish grievances and their remedies than they do about reforms which directly affect their own interests. Under such circumstances, if their leader's intentions with regard to home rule were left undefined, it would be possible for campaign speakers in each English constituency to dwell with especial emphasis on the features of the Liberal programme especially attractive to that locality. On the other hand, the opponents of the Home Rule bill, which Mr. GLADSTONE is resolved to pass, and it will necessarily become the pivot of discussion. The other aims and promises of which so much was said at the meeting of the Liberal Federation in Newcastle will gradually be lost sight of, and the contest will ultimately turn on the single question whether Ireland should have a particular kind of State government.

It is likely enough that Mr. GLADSTONE will lose some votes by a frank and full avowal of his purposes with respect to Ireland, and, if he were a younger man, he might prefer to postpone their publication until he had resumed the responsibilities of office. But at his advanced age he cannot reasonably expect to take part in more than a general election, and to him, therefore, it is of vital moment that the verdict of the people on that occasion shall be unequivocal and peremptory. With his precarious tenure of life he cannot leave it to the power of the Unionists to say that, while the electors might have acquiesced in the bestowal of some kind of home rule on Ireland, they by no means sanctioned the delinquent scheme which was for the first time

put forward after Mr. GLADSTONE's return to power. Relying on this specious argument, they would undoubtedly encourage the House of Lords to reject the measure and thus compel a second appeal to the country. On the other hand, the Lords would scarcely dare to throw out a bill, all of whose details had been subjected to vigilant inspection and thorough discussion during a political campaign. By resisting the unanimous, explicit fiat of the nation they would imperil the existence of the hereditary chamber. Not the concession of home rule to Ireland, but the abolition of the upper House would be the question on which the ensuing election would turn. Mr. GLADSTONE has, in other words, determined that the judgment rendered by the British nation in the approaching trial of the Irish cause shall be conclusive and beyond appeal.

The details of the new measure have not yet been made known to us, though it is expected that they will be very shortly. We are especially curious to learn what arrangements will be made for regulating Ireland's contribution to the imperial revenues, and whether the control of the Irish consular will be delegated to the new Dublin Government. On the answers given to these questions largely depends the maintenance of harmonious relations between the Gladstonians and the McCarthyites. It is already announced that the revised scheme embodies one of Mr. PARSELL's demands, namely, that appointments to the Irish judiciary shall be made by the Irish executive. We are also informed, as indeed we have long had reason to expect, that Ireland will continue to be represented at Westminster, though whether by as many members as she now sends is not stated. One more feature of the amended plan has been divulged, viz., that the Dublin legislature will consist of two chambers, though on what principle the upper House is to be constituted is not mentioned. It is very doubtful whether the Nationalists would tolerate a restoration of legislative rights to the Irish peerage.

Mr. LISPENARD STEWART, on the other hand, has never found time even to read the Electrical Execution law. He has no opinion on the subject of the right of the New York newspapers to publish the news. He has nothing to say concerning the attempt of the cranks commanded by Commodore GERRY to gag a free press.

We do not see how any self-respecting newspaper can support the ill-informed and indolent Mr. STEWART. Nor do we see why any intelligent Republican citizen should vote for the indifferent and ill-informed Mr. STEWART, as against a gentleman who is so incomparably his superior in appreciating the importance of guarding jealously one of the most precious of American liberties.

It has for some time been generally acknowledged by the Gladstonians that no matter how large a majority they might obtain at the next general election, they would not reintroduce the Home Rule bill of 1893 in its original form. As to what changes would be made, however, there has been no authoritative announcement. The Gladstonians, taking for granted that none would be made until the contest at the ballot box was over, have professed to believe that Mr. GLADSTONE does not know his own mind, or is afraid to let the Liberal electors know what they will be voting for.

As a matter of fact, Mr. GLADSTONE has formed a definite conception of what he will do for Ireland, and means to proclaim it before the election. It is not usually deemed judicious to expose all the details of a proposed measure to the eyes of enemies and lukewarm friends during the campaign preceding a general election. Provisions which would be swallowed with more or less reluctance after an overwhelming triumph of the Liberal party at the ballot box might cause Gladstonians to falter and waver while the outcome of the contest was uncertain. The political tactician at present unite in accepting the guidance of Mr. GLADSTONE are extremely heterogeneous, and a Home Rule bill which would be acceptable to one section might be distasteful to another. It is also probable that a large number of Mr. GLADSTONE's English followers care much less about Irish grievances and their remedies than they do about reforms which directly affect their own interests. Under such circumstances, if their leader's intentions with regard to home rule were left undefined, it would be possible for campaign speakers in each English constituency to dwell with especial emphasis on the features of the Liberal programme especially attractive to that locality. On the